

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-10, 12, 14, 16-25, 27, 29, 31-45, 47, 49, and 51-54 are in the case.

The applicants have studied the Advisory Action dated March 31, 2005 and the Final Office Action dated November 23, 2004, and believe the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 16-21, 23-29, 31-37, 39-41, 43-49, and 41-54 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,119,377 to Cobb et al., (Cobb). Claims 3, 7, 22, 38 and 42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cobb in view of the background section. Claims 15, 30 and 50 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cobb in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,708,291 to Kidder. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 as amended is directed to *inter alia*, “providing a directory including entries corresponding to identifiers capable of being received from the service function, wherein the directory maintains error information for identifiers that describes a specific cause of the test operation failure associated with the identifier; accessing one entry in the directory corresponding to the received identifier, wherein the generated error information comprises the description of the specific cause of the error in the directory entry for the received identifier; detecting a change in a version number of the service program; accessing an updated directory reflecting changes resulting from an update to service functions in the service program; and replacing the directory with the updated directory, wherein the updated directory is capable of including modifications to the identifiers and error information.” It is the Examiner’s position that the Application Data Table (ADT) 10 of the Cobb reference meets the recited “directory” which includes “entries corresponding to identifiers capable of being received from the service function, wherein the directory maintains error information for identifiers that describes a specific cause of the test operation failure associated with the identifier ...” The applicants respectfully disagree. For example, claim 1 further recites an “error handling agent” which “accesses error information associated with the identifier and generates error information describing a specific cause of the error that caused the test operation to fail ...” It is the Examiner’s position that the recited “error handling agent” is met by the “architecture generic alert function” of the Cobb reference. However, it is clear that the “architecture generic alert function” of the Cobb reference does not

utilize the Application Data Table (ADT) 10 of the Cobb reference to generate error information. Instead, as conceded by the Examiner, the Early Detection Data Capture (EDDC) process cited by the Examiner utilizes the ADT 10 to generate error information:

“The EDDC process uses this table information to generate a dump ... describing a specific cause of the error..” Advisory Action.

Moreover, the Examiner concedes (Office action mailed June 3, 2004, page 5) that the Cobb reference does not specifically disclose “detecting a change in a version number of the service program; accessing an updated directory reflecting changes resulting from an update to service functions in the service program; and replacing the directory with the updated directory, wherein the updated directory is capable of including modifications to the identifiers and error information” as required by claim 1. It is the Examiner’s position that these deficiencies of the Cobb reference are met by citations to the Kidder reference and that it would be obvious to modify the system of the Cobb reference in view of the Examiner’s citations to the Kidder reference. The applicants respectfully disagree.

The Examiner’s citations to the Kidder reference appear to describe a system in which “a process registers a version number indicating which API version should be used by other processes wishing to communicate with it.” Kidder, col. 23, lines 24 et seq. It is the Examiner’s position that recited service program of claim 1 is met by the software program 30 having error detection code 35 or alternatively, EDDC calls, placed at error detection points during development of the program 30. Final office action mailed November 23, 2004, pages 2-3. Thus it appears to be the Examiner’s position that it would be obvious to modify the software program 30 to register a version number to indicate which API version or call should be used to communicate with the program 30, in accordance with the Kidder reference. However, as noted by the Examiner, the ADT 10 to be utilized by the EDDC process is identified to the EDDC process in a call to the EDDC process *by the software program 30*. More specifically, the ADT 10 is named in the EDDC call 35 of the software program 30 via the TABNAME keyword. Cobb reference, col. 5, lines 58 et seq. Thus, the Examiner has identified no need for the software program 30 of the Cobb reference to register a version number to be used for selection of an ADT 10 since it is the software program 30 itself (through its call 35) which selects the ADT 10 for use

by the EDDC process. The Examiner has cited no portion of the Cobb or Kidder references which teaches or suggests that the particular ADT 10 may be selected by any process other than the software program 30 itself. Hence, it is clear that it would not be obvious to modify the software program 30 to register a version number to enable another process or agent to detect a change in the version number of the software program 30, access an updated ADT 10 reflecting changes resulting from an update to service functions in the software program 30, and replace the ADT 10 with the updated ADT 10.

Independent claims 5, 20, 36 and 40 may be distinguished in a similar fashion. Moreover, the dependent claims include additional limitations, which in combination with the base and intervening claims from which they depend provide still further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

The Examiner's citations to the background do not obviate the deficiencies of the Examiner's citations to the Cobb and Kidder references. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejections of claims 1-54 should be withdrawn.


The Examiner has made various comments concerning the anticipation or obviousness of certain features of the present inventions. Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants have addressed those comments directly hereinabove or the Examiner's comments are deemed moot in view of the above response.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-54 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants have not added any claims. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0449.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: May 2, 2005

By:   
William K. Konrad  
Registration No. 28,868

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor  
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP  
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210  
Beverly Hills, CA 90212  
Tel: 310-553-7977  
Fax: 310-556-7984